



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,090	01/31/2001	Abigail Jane Sellen	30003278	6082

7590 05/21/2004

Paul Greeley
c/o Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle
Suite 903
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/773,090

Applicant(s)

SELLEN ET AL.

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Preliminary Amendment, received on 08/24/2004, has been entered. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8 and 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karidis et al., Patent No. 6,727,894, and further in view of Kashiwagi et al., Patent No. 6,396,598.

4. As to claims 1, 10 and 15, Karidis et al. disclose text processing apparatus comprising:

a first text editing unit having a screen upon which text may be displayed, and a first manual actuator by means of which a user is able to interact with text displayed on the first screen (Abstract, col. 5, line 58 – col. 7, line 7 and col. 12, lines 18-28 and Figs.

Art Unit: 2176

1 & 4: computing device 100 (first text editing unit) includes a display screen 202 for displaying graphics and/or text, keyboard 204 (manual actuator), and a processor 420 may operate using software such as products manufactured by Microsoft Corporation);

a second text editing unit having a second screen upon which text may be displayed, and a second manual actuator by means of which a user is able to interact with text displayed on the second screen (Abstract, col. 7, lines 33-45, col. 9, lines 51-63, and Figs. 1 and 5-6, and 10: recording unit 101 (second text editing unit) includes display LCD 108, a processor or microcontroller 120 and inking stylus 152 (second manual actuator));

wherein the first and second actuators are independently operable, and enable interaction with text displayed on respective screens independently of each other (col. 8, lines 30-63: the recording unit (second text editing unit) may be separated from device 100 (first text editing unit) and a UBS link may allow both first and second text editing units to be detached and decoupled each other such as for independent operations); and

the first and second text editing units are connected to each other to enable text to be imported from one unit directly to another unit (col. 8, lines 30-63: the recording unit (second text editing unit) may be separated from device 100 (first text editing unit) and a UBS link may allow both first and second text editing units to be detached and decoupled each other such as for independent operations; col. 11, line 65 – col. 12, line 10 and col. 13, lines 42-56; synchronization and updating of information such as between processors 420 (first text editing unit) and 120 (second text editing unit));

However, Karidis et al. do not explicitly disclose thereby to enable text selected from a first document displayed on one unit to be inserted directly at a predetermined location in a document displayed on the other unit. In the same field of endeavor, Kashiwagi et al. disclose an electronic memo processing apparatus (text editing unit) includes pen 306 (manual actuator) to add a memo (text) overlapped to a document displayed on a computer 300 (another text editing unit) and the edition can be done in a manner as if a line, an arrow, or characters are directly written on the document, and the modification includes not only deletion but also insertion movement, copy from other portion (col. 16, line 36 – col. 20, line 28 and col. 27, lines 26-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kashiwagi et al. into the flexibly interfaceable portable computing device of Karidis et al. to include enable text selected from a first document displayed on one unit to be inserted directly at a predetermined location in a document displayed on the other unit, and by doing so it would provide user friendly environment which allows a plurality of users to add text from one device to another.

5. As to claim 2, Karidis et al. and Kashiwagi et al. (Karidis-Kashiwagi) disclose a text processing apparatus according to claim 1 wherein the first and second text editing units each have a graphical user interface, and interaction with text displayed on a screen is possible by using a manual actuator to interact with a visual element of the user interface on a screen (Karidis, Abstract, col. 5, line 58 – col. 7, line 7 and col. 12, lines 18-28 and Figs. 1 & 4: computing device 100 (first text editing unit) includes a

Art Unit: 2176

display screen 202 for displaying graphics and/or text, keyboard 204 (manual actuator), and a processor 420 may operate using software such as products manufactured by Microsoft Corporation; col. 7, lines 33-45, col. 9, lines 51-63, and Figs. 1 and 5-6, and 10: recording unit 101 (second text editing unit) includes display LCD 108, a processor or microcontroller 120 and inking stylus 152 (second manual actuator)).

6. As to claim 3, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose wherein the visual element is either an item from a pull-down menu or an icon (Karidis, col. 7, lines 33-45).

7. As to claim 4, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose wherein the first text editing unit is a computer running a word processing program (Karidis, col. 6, line 61 – col. 7, line 7).

8. As to claim 5, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose wherein the first and second text editing units are in a client-server relationship respectively (Karidis, col. 14, lines 4-16).

9. As to claim 6, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose wherein the second text editing unit includes a battery, is portable and comprises at least one processor and at least one memory to enable running of a word processing program compatible with the word processing program running on the personal-type computer (Karidis, col. 7, line 33 – col. 8, line 45).

Art Unit: 2176

10. As to claim 7, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose wherein the word processing program of the second text editing unit is a simplified version of the word processing program running on the computer, and is adapted to run only when the first and second text editing units are disconnected, and the client-server relationship is broken (Karidis, col. 13, line 42 – col. 14, line 16).

11. As to claim 8, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose wherein the manual actuator of at least one of the editing units is selected from the group consisting of a touch-sensitive screen and a mouse (Karidis, col. 9, lines 25-35).

12. As to claims 11 and 17, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose first and second distinct monitors for the first and second text editors (Karidis, Abstract, col. 5, line 58 – col. 7, line 7 and col. 12, lines 18-28 and Figs. 1 & 4: computing device 100 (first text editing unit) includes a display screen 202 for displaying graphics and/or text, keyboard 204 (manual actuator), and a processor 420 may operate using software such as products manufactured by Microsoft Corporation; col. 7, lines 33-45, col. 9, lines 51-63, and Figs. 1 and 5-6, and 10: recording unit 101 (second text editing unit) includes display LCD 108, a processor or microcontroller 120 and inking stylus 152 (second manual actuator))

13. As to claim 12, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose wherein at least one of the actuators is a mouse (Karidis, col. 20, lines 7-51).

Art Unit: 2176

14. As to claim 13, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose wherein one of the actuators is a touch-sensitive screen in combination with an artifact for touching the screen (Karidis, col. 9, lines 25-35).

15. As to claim 14, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose wherein the manual actuators are adapted to operate in conjunction with a graphical user interface in each of the windows (Karidis, col. 11, lines 1-17).

16. As to claim 16, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose wherein selection of the text in the first document is performed by operating a first manual actuator in conjunction with a graphical user interface for the first text editor, and selection of the location in the second document is performed by operating a second manual actuator; distinct from the first manual actuator, in conjunction with a graphical user interface for the second text editor.

17. As to claim 18, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose wherein the first and second text editors are hosted on physically distinct machines, and the method includes sending text from a first machine to a second machine via a wireless link (Karidis, col. 11, lines 49-57).

18. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karidis et al., Patent No. 6,727,894 and Kashiwagi et al., Patent No. 6,396,598 as discussed in

Art Unit: 2176

claims 1-8 and 10-18 above and further in view of Robotham et al., Patent No. 6,704,024.

19. As to claim 9, Karidis-Kashiwagi disclose the claimed invention as discussed in claims 1-8 and 10-18 above. However, Karidis-Kashiwagi do not explicitly disclose wherein the connection between the two editing units is selected from the group consisting of a direct cable connection; wireless Bluetooth connection wireless Ethernet connection. Robotham et al. disclose a server communicates with a client and the physical communications path can be wireless and the communications configuration over the communication path can be personal area network such as a Bluetooth wireless protocol, local area network such as Ethernet. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Robotham et al. and Karidis-Kashiwagi to include wherein the connection between the two editing units is selected from the group consisting of a direct cable connection; wireless Bluetooth connection wireless Ethernet connection in order to provide the server to exchange of information with the client.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 (After Final Communications only)

(703) 872-9306 (Official Communications)

(703) 746-7240 (for Official Status Inquiries, Draft Communications only)

Inquiries of a general nature relating to the general status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER